

## Message Text

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00381 01 OF 02 211434Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ACDE-00 ISO-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00

NSC-05 /100 W

----- 009218

P R 211225Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1155

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0381

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: N/A

TAGS: PRM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DE VOS JULY 17, 1975 PRESS CONFERENCE  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

REF: MBFR VIENNA 0364

SUMMARY: NETHERLANDS REP DE VOS HAD A MUCH EASIER TIME  
WITH THE PRESS THAN STRULAK IN THE Q AND A SESSION  
FOLLOWING THE PRESS STATEMENT (MBFR VIENNA 0364). NETHERLANDS  
REP WAS ABLE TO GET THE MAIN ALLIED POINTS ON THE DEFINITION  
ISSUE ACROSS, AND HAD A CHANCE TO MAKE A STRONG CASE FOR  
DATA. ALTHOUGH THERE WAS SOME PRESS CURIOSITY ABOUT  
WESTERN MOVES ON THE FLANK ISSUE, THE RESPONSES WERE READILY  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00381 01 OF 02 211434Z

ACCEPTED. OF THE NINE QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO DEVOS, ONE DEALT WITH

FORCES DEFINITIONS, THREE WITH DATA, FOUR WITH THE FLANK ISSUE, AND ONE WITH JULY 17 PLENARY STATEMENTS. INITIAL AVAILABLE PRESS AND WIRE SERVICE REACTION TOUCHED ON ALL THE MAJOR POINTS OF ALLIED CONCERN IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AS OUTLINED IN THE WESTERN PRESS STATEMENT, YET CITED BOTH SPOKESMAN AS HOLDING OUT HOPE FOR EVENTUAL SOLUTION OF OUTSTANDING PROBLEMS. END SUMMARY

1. Q. (FINANCIAL TIMES) MR. AMBASSADOR, YOU MENTIONED IN YOUR STATEMENT THAT THE EAST HAS ALSO MADE CERTAIN LIMITED CHANGES IN ITS REDUCTION PROPOSALS, AND YOU SAY THAT THERE WERE PROCEDURAL MODIFICATIONS. AMBASSADOR STRULAK AT THE END OF HIS STATEMENT REVEALED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE MADE A NEW PROPOSAL CONCERNING AGREED DEFINITION OF ALL FORCES, INCLUDING THE GROUND FORCES AND THE AIR FORCES. IN YOUR VIEW, IS THE LATEST PROPOSAL AMBASSADOR STRULAK MENTIONED TO COME ALSO UNDER THE HEADING OF PROCEDURAL MODIFICATIONS, NOT AFFECTING THE BASIC SUBSTANCE?

A. THESE ARE TWO SEPARATE ISSUES. FIRST, THE PROCEDURAL MODIFICATIONS THEY HAVE MADE IN THE PAST, WE HAVE DISCUSSED THESE PREVIOUSLY. THERE IS NOTHING NEW THERE; I WAS JUST REFERRING TO THE OLD PROPOSALS WHICH I UNDERSTAND ARE WELL KNOWN TO YOU. WITH REGARD TO THE SECOND SUBJECT YOU FIRST MENTIONED, I AM A LITTLE SURPRISED THAT IT WAS MENTIONED. I WOULD NOT HAVE MENTIONED IT MYSELF, FOR THE REASON THAT WE HAVE ESTABLISHED RULES OF CONFIDENTIALITY WHICH ARE A PART OF OUR AGREED RULES OF PROCEDURE. THE SECOND REASON WHY I WOULD NOT HAVE MENTIONED IT MYSELF IS THAT THE STATE OF DISCUSSIONS ON THAT SUBJECT DOES NOT IN OUR OPINION WARRANT ANY RAISING OF EXPECTATIONS THAT WE ARE MOVING CLOSER TO AGREEMENT ON THE BASIC ISSUES INVOLVED. IT IS A TECHNICAL ASPECT, AND IT HAS TO BE FACED, IT HAS TO BE ADDRESSED AT SOME TIME IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. AS A MATTER OF FACT, WE ON OUR SIDE HAD ABOUT A YEAR AGO PROPOSED A SPECIFIC FORMAT FOR THE DISCUSSION OF THIS MATTER. SO I LEAVE IT UP TO YOU

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00381 01 OF 02 211434Z

TO DECIDE WHETHER THE CONNOTATION WHICH MY EASTERN COLLEAGUE APPARENTLY IMPLIED, THAT THIS IS A NEW EASTERN INITIATIVE, WHETHER THAT CONNOTATION IS JUSTIFIED. AS A MATTER OF FACT, ABOUT A YEAR AGO WE PROPOSED THIS MATTER IN A SPECIFIC WAY. WE SPECIFICALLY PROPOSED TO DISCUSS IT IN RELATION TO DATA, BECAUSE THE FACT IS THAT QUESTIONS OF DEFINITION TEND TO TOUCH ON DATA.

IT IS DIFFICULT TO SEPARATE THE TWO ASPECTS  
COMPLETELY, AND SO YOU SOON COME BACK TO THE  
POINT WHICH WE HAVE MADE BEFORE, THAT IN  
ORDER TO RESOLVE THE BASIC ISSUES WHICH ARE  
DIVIDING US AT THIS MOMENT, AND WHEN YOU DISCUSS  
DEFINITIONS YOU ALSO ARE APT TO TOUCH ON ASPECTS OF  
BASIC ISSUES; IT IS NECESSARY,  
IT IS ESSENTIAL TO HAVE SOME SHARED UNDER-  
STANDING OF THE CONCRETE FACTS OF THE SITUATION  
WE ARE NEGOTIATING ABOUT. THAT IS THE REASON WHY  
WE PROPOSED TO DISCUSS THE ASPECTS OF DEFINITION  
AND DATA IN THEIR OBVIOUS CONNECTION. THAT IS  
ALSO THE REASON WHY WE STILL THINK THAT A DIS-  
CUSSION OF DEFINITIONS IN ABSTRACTO, AS THE  
EASTERN SIDE HAS NOW PROPOSED TO DO, CANNOT

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00381 02 OF 02 211444Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-07 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-02 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-15 TRSE-00

NSC-05 /100 W

----- 009336

P R 211225Z JUL 75

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1156

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

UNCLAS SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0381

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

LEAD VERY FAR, UNLESS YOU ARE ALSO PREPARED TO DISCUSS THE DATA ASPECTS. AND THERE WE ARE STILL IN THE SAME SITUATION I MENTIONED IN MY STATEMENT. WE HAVE VOLUNTEERED CERTAIN DATA. THEY HAVE CONTESTED THE ACCURACY OF THESE DATA. THEY DO NOT WANT TO TELL US WHAT IS WRONG WITH THEM, BUT DO NOT WANT TO GIVE US THEIR OWN DATA. THAT IS THE SITUATION.

2. Q. (CBS) WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE REASON WHY THEY DON'T WANT TO GIVE FIGURES. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS BEHIND THIS?

A. I AM HESITANT TO ENGAGE IN SPECULATIONS ON MOTIVES OF THE OTHER SIDE. I JUST DON'T KNOW; IT IS OBVIOUS TO US, AND IT SEEMS CLEAR, THAT YOU HAVE TO HAVE SOME UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00381 02 OF 02 211444Z

DISCUSSION ON DATA, ON THE ACTUAL EFFECTS OF AN AGREEMENT. YOU CAN'T CONCLUDE A CONTRACT IF YOU DON'T KNOW WHAT IN SPECIFIC TERMS IT MEANS. WE JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND THIS EASTERN POSITION.

3. Q. (CBS) IS IT YOUR BELIEF THAT THEY ARE HIDING SOMETHING BY FAILING TO REVEAL THE FIGURES, WHILE YOU ARE WILLING TO DO SO?

A. AS I SAID BEFORE, I DO NOT WANT TO ENTER INTO CONJECTURE AND SPECULATION ON THIS.

4. (CHRITIAN SCIENCE MONITOR) WHEN WE SPEAK ABOUT FIGURES, DOES THAT APPLY TO BASIC OVERALL FIGURES, BROAD FIGURSS ON THE NUMBER OF TANKS AND GROUND FORCES, AS WELL AS TO MORE SOPHISTICATED DETAILS. IS IT A COMPLETE BLANKET AMOUNT?

A. IT IS A COMPLETE BLANKET ON FIGURES. THEY ARE WORKING WITH PERCENTAGES IN THEIR REDUCTION PROPOSAL, BUT OVIOUSLY, JUGGLING PERCENTAGES IF YOU DON'T KNOW TO WHAT FIGURES THESE PERCENTAGES HAVE TO BE APPLIED IS A RATHER ILLUSORY EXERCISE. IT DOESN'T GIVE YOU ANYTHING. SO AFTER ALMOST TWO YEARS OF NEGOTIATIONS WE STILL DON'T KNOW WHAT THE EASTERN SIDE IS REALLY THINKING, IN WHAT CONCRETE TERMS IT IS THINKING AS FAR AS REDUCTION PROPOSALS ARE CONCERNED.

5. Q. (PRESSE) MR AMBASSADOR, YOU JUST MENTIONED IN YOUR COMMUNIQUE THAT IN THIS ROUND THE WESTERN SIDE PRESENTED PROPOSALS DESIGNED TO SAFEGUARD THE SECURITY OF FLANK COUNTRIES. IS THERE ANY ACTUALITY TO THIS QUESTION? BECAUSE IT IS THE FIRST TIME THAT YOU MENTION IT.

A. AS FAR AS WE ARE CONCERNED, THIS QUESTION HAS BEEN ACTUAL SINCE THE COMMUNIQUE OF JUNE 1973, WHICH STATES THE PRINCIPLE THAT ANY AGREEMENT MUST BE WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE SECURITY OF EITHER SIDE, MUST BE IN CONFORMITY WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY FOR EACH PARTY CONCERNED. WE THINK THAT THE SECURITY OF THE FLANK COUNTRIES WHO ARE PARTICIPATING IN THESE NEGOTIA-  
UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00381 02 OF 02 211444Z

TIONS, EVEN IF THEY HAVE A SPECIAL STATUS AS PARTICIPANTS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS,- THAT IS ALWAYS AN ACTUAL PROBLEM AND A BASIC QUESTION.

6. Q. (PRESSE) DID THE EASTERN SIDE RAISE THIS QUESTION IN THIS ROUND?

A. NO, THEY HAVEN'T MENTIONED THIS ASPECT.

7. Q. (REUTERS) AS THIS IS OBVIOUSLY FAR IN THE FUTURE, DEPENDENT ON A BASIC AGREEMENT, IS THERE SOME SPECIFIC REASON FOR RAISING THIS QUESTION AT THIS STAGE?

A. IT HAS BEEN A BASIC ASPECT OF OUR POSITION FROM THE VERY BEGINNING. WE HAVE NOW GONE INTO SOMEWHAT MORE DETAILS. WE HAVE THE RULE OF CONFIDENTIALITY, AND I WOULD NOT WANT TO GO INTO THESE DETAILS AT THIS TIME. WE ARE AWAITING A RESPONSE FROM THE EASTERN SIDE ON THIS.

8. Q. (REUTERS) BUT IT DOES NOT ENVISAGE ANY PARTICIPATION BY THE FLANK COUNTRIES IN THE REDUCTION PROCESS?

A. NO, THEY ARE NOT INVOLVED AS REGARDS EITHER FORCES OR TERRITORY IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS, SO THEY WOULD NOT SIGN AN AGREEMENT. THIS PUTS UPON US AN EXTRA RESPONSIBILITY TO SEE TO IT THAT THEIR SECURITY IS UNIMPAIRED.

9. Q. (CSM) WERE THE TWO STATEMENTS THIS MORNING CONCERNED WITH SPECIFICS, WITH MATTERS OF SUBSTANCE, OR WERE THEY MORE GENERAL STATEMENTS. DID THE WESTERN SPOKESMAN ALLUDE TO THE DISAPPOINTMENT ABOUT THE FAILURE OF THIS ROUND TO GET ANYWHERE?

A. INDEED, THE STATEMENT EXPRESSED SOME OF OUR DISAPPOINTMENT, STRESSING OF COURSE AGAIN THE MAIN POINTS OF OUR POSITION AND ITS ESSENTIAL ASPECTS, WHICH WILL HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT SOMEHOW; OUR BASIC SECURITY REQUIREMENTS INVOLVED, WHICH WILL HAVE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. IT WAS BASICALLY A SUMMARY OF OUR POSITION. (FOLLOW-UP QUESTION: WHAT ABOUT THE EASTERN SIDE?) I DO NOT INTEND TO GO INTO THE EASTERN STATEMENT. I ASSUME THAT AMBASSADOR STRULAK MAY HAVE TOLD YOU ABOUT IT. I DON'T

THINK IT IS MY DUTY TO DO THAT. END TEXT.RESOR

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

PAGE 04 MBFR V 00381 02 OF 02 211444Z

UNCLASSIFIED

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, PRESS CONFERENCES, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** n/a  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** n/a  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:**  
**Disposition Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975MBFRV00381  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** N/A  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750251-0438  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750737/aaaabhdn.tel  
**Line Count:** 284  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 6  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** 75 MBFR VIENNA 0364  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** CollinP0  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 28 FEB 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <28 FEB 2003 by ThomasVJ>; APPROVED <16 MAR 2004 by CollinP0>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: DE VOS JULY 17, 1975 PRESS CONFERENCE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO, (DE VOS)  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006